

**The Kentucky Board of Licensure for
Marriage and Family Therapists**
May 24, 2012
Minutes

.....

The regular scheduled meeting of the Kentucky Board of Licensure of Marriage and Family Therapists was held at the Office of Occupations and Professions, 911 Leawood Drive, Frankfort, Kentucky on May 24, 2012.

Board Members Present:

Ms. Jane Prouty
Mr. Tony Watkins
Ms. Stephanie Head
Mr. Richard Hamon
Ms. Sandy Miller, Chair

Occupations and Professions:

Marcia Egbert, Board Administrator
Courtney Bourne, Executive Director
Susan Ellis, Operations Section Supervisor
Debra Day, Administrative Section Supervisor
Janet Cox, Internal Policy Analyst II

Board Member Absent:

Ms. Carolyn Miller-Cooper
Dr. Tom Robbins

Office of the Attorney General:

Angela Evans

.....

Call to Order: Chair Sandra Miller called the meeting to order at 9:53 a.m.

Minutes: The Board reviewed minutes from April 26, 2012. Tony Watkins made a motion to accept the minutes as written. Richard Hamon seconded the motion. Marcia Egbert informed the Board that Executive Director Courtney Bourne had requested to make some corrections to the wording of the minutes in the O & P Report as follows:

On the third line it should read “a new formula based on the annual receipts, time of board administrator and number of licensees,” and deleting the words, “administrative costs of two fiscal staff that handled payments and general operating cost.”

Sandra Miller asked what the reason was for striking the words “and two fiscal staff that handled payments and general operating cost.” Ms. Bourne responded that the wording was inaccurate. The formula was based on three factors; the number of licensees, an annual cycle of receipts and the time of the Board Administrator.

Sandra Miller asked if there was a change in the motion. No one responded and Ms. Miller said the motion stands. A vote on the motion was taken and the original motion to accept the minutes as written was approved.

Jane Prouty questioned whether the minutes would reflect the change. Ms. Miller stated that there was no change and the minutes were approved as submitted. Attorney Angela Evans stated that Ms. Bourne’s statement, “that the minutes were approved with inaccuracies” could be put in the minutes as an explanation as to why the minutes should be changed but due to the lack of a motion to amend the minutes to reflect the change the original motion would stand as made.

Board Monthly Financial Report:

The Board Monthly Financial Report for July 1, 2011 through April 30, 2012 was presented to the Board for review. Janet Cox sent an e-mail (in packet) informing the Board that due to a glitch in the system, travel last month was posted to the main report and was processed but was not posted to the detail report. Ms. Cox stated that the travel will show up on next month's report. Jane Prouty made a motion to accept the Financial Report. Tony Watkins seconded the motion. The motion passed.

Report from O & P: (Transcribed from tape.)

Executive Director Courtney Bourne attended the meeting to memorialize the FY 2013-2014 Memorandum of Agreement between the Board of Marriage and Family Therapy and the Office of Occupations and Professions. This meeting was taped and the following is transcribed from that tape.

Courtney Bourne clarified that the Board received an e-mail from her since the last meeting and also introduced behind the scenes staff; Janet Cox, Internal Policy Analyst II; Debra Day, Administrative Section Supervisor; and Susan Ellis, Operations Section Supervisor. Ms. Bourne stated that she would like to reflect in the minutes that there are three components to the formula used for the MOA which are: "In July of 2011, they looked at your number of licensees; then, around August of last year, they asked your Board Administrator at the time, how much of her time did she use working on your Board; and the third component was one year cycle of receipts. Those three components factored together with the other boards in the office resulted in a more equitable way to distribute the administrative fees for each board. Of all the variations the budget office looked at, this seemed to be the most equitable way for all Boards to have the administrative fee accessed.

Tony Watkins asked, "The total receipts last year were \$2 million dollars for all the Boards?" Ms. Bourne responded, "Yes." Mr. Watkins then asked, "So the total percent for MFT was 4.67%? And the total operating cost projected for this year was \$1.2 million dollars?" Ms. Bourne responded, "Yes." Mr. Watkins asked, "So, our administrative cost is pretty much equivalent to our percentage of receipts for all of O & P?" Ms. Bourne responded, "That correlation is correct, that is not how...that sole factor did not establish your administrative fee. I see how the correlation and it is correct but that sole factor is not the only one that created your administrative fee. They also considered the number of licensees, the amount of receipts that came in and the amount of time your Board Administrator spent on your Board. They did not use just the one factor to come up with your administrative fee." Mr. Watkins stated, "So, last month we asked if we could see a comparison with other Boards and I don't see that here." Ms. Bourne stated, "We can discuss other Boards. Do you want to look at boards with relatively the same number of licensees? Relative percent of staff time? Or Receipts? Because, once we compare the board to other Boards with similar licensees, you may bring in more money, you may bring in less or your Board Administrator may spend more or less time on this board versus a board with similar licensees or similar receipts." Mr. Watkins replied, "It just kind of seems like a shell game. I understand three criteria, and I understand that no two boards are going to be the same. It's not solely based on the number of licensees or revenue, or percentage of staff time. Without data to compare this with, discussion is not really helpful." Sandra Miller stated, "It is difficult to make a comparison without having data to compare too. I am wondering if any other Boards went up by the percentage amount that we did, 241%?" Ms. Bourne corrected her by stating, "It was 140%. We did have a board that went up 200%." Ms. Miller asked which board that was and Ms. Bourne said it was Hearing Instrument Specialists. Ms. Bourne stated that Boards went up anywhere from \$2,200 to \$43,000 or \$46,000. Ms. Miller asked how much MFT's went up. Tony Watkins responded that it went up from \$24,000 to \$59,000. Ms. Bourne corrected him and said it was \$34,000. Tony Watkins asked Ms. Bourne about something she said last month about some fees

that O & P had historically that is gone now and is that what is driving the increase? Ms. Bourne said she could expound on that. "Since 2004, O & P has not received any general fund monies. With that, what reserve O & P had, they used to float the Boards and to band aide the situation for these years. That's seven years. That balance that we used to supplement fiscal with. With the legislature not putting general fund money in here, there is no money to continue on. So, the only way they have budgeted now for O & P to be funded is through administrative fees. So, the sole make-up of the O & P budget is on these boards' fees and the next boards' fees. That's how it is all paid to here and is how all the Boards are operating." Tony Watkins stated, "No more tax dollars are being used to fund O & P?" Ms. Bourne said, "Right, to supplement, that might be a better word." Mr. Watkins stated that the licensees might see this as a tax. Courtney stated that it is taxpayer's money too, but no general fund monies. Ms. Miller asked if there were any other cost cutting measures being taken by O & P? Ms. Bourne stated, "Like all state agencies, we've been doing reductions here for some time. Most recently we did a 1.5% reduction." Ms. Miller asked, "A reduction in staff, a reduction in what?" Susan Ellis interjected that for example the Board contract investigators had to take a 1.5% reduction. O & P also had a reduction in FY 2012. It was \$54,800 and of that \$39,800 reduction was for personnel expenditures. O & P had to take the 1.5% reduction like all state agencies. Tony Watkins said, "Here's what is causing heartburn, first of all such a sizable increase and the fact that it is 2/3's of what we have coming in, and that really is going to affect ... I remember in 2008 or 2009, an audit was done by the Finance Cabinet on our Board and they came to us, the Director at the time said, your board will be insolvent by 2012 going with the revenue coming in and the expenditures. So, we did fee increases and I went before the committee and Representative Lee and he said, "Mr. Watkins, we don't like to allow the fees to be raised because nobody likes to pay more money. Can your Board assure us that there will be no more fee increases?" And what I asked him was. "Could he assure me that they weren't going to raise our taxes anymore?" So, this is going to require us as a Board to look pretty quickly at fee increases or it's going to be a matter of time before, based on the percentages of money we are paying out to O & P and for Administrative services, there was more cushion then than there is now." Courtney Bourne responded, "I believe that, and I'll let Susan expound on this, your appropriation or allotment is \$116,000 which is above your last cycle of receipts from last year." Ms. Ellis stated, "This board has a cash carry over for the next two years and going into Fiscal Year 2015, you have a cash carry forward of \$87,300. If there is a concern about that this increase is going to use up all of your surplus, it's not. You are going to be fine. We wouldn't have included it in the budget if you couldn't have afforded it and it wouldn't have passed the state budget directors office." Courtney Bourne said that you won't be looking at raising fees. Angela Evans interjected, "The information that we have gotten from another board, and they're verifying this for me, is that this fiscal year there is a concern from other attorney's from other boards that have done the math and they are saying that they will not have that reserve." Ms. Ellis asked if they were working within their budgets. Ms. Evans said that they were. Ms. Evans said, "Yes, it is fine for now, but their concern is what happens four years from now. Do they have enough money then? That is the concern of this Board. They are fine for 2013 and 2014 but what will happen in 2015-2016? The concern is that it might increase. If it increases to six figures, the allotment is increased and then it's going to come back and the same process is going to come through, there are six figures now, they're going to say we need more money for some reason so they dip into that reserve again and that is the concern that the attorneys are hearing from the Boards, that they are going to keep dipping into that reserve until it's not there anymore." Ms. Bourne said she would speak to that, "Yes, we did have an attorney in one of the meetings who was not as knowledgeable as they thought they were with regard to speaking to the budget and did misinform their board. We have provided them with that information as well in regard to their budget. This is a two year contract just like the biennium budget. No one really knows in two years where this economy will be, no one knows exactly who's to say if the prices are going to go up astronomically, or if they are going to go down. Even with the historical part that you can see, your

fees have gone in this wild shape here. It is a two-year contract and in October of 2013 they will be looking to prepare the next biennium budget and they'll want to see, is this something that MFT can sustain? Is it something the ABC Board can sustain? How do we look at changing that then? But, we're not at that fork in the road yet. We're simply here at the place where we have got to prepare for, we've got to enter into a contract for services provided for this biennium alone." Tony Watkins said, "With past biennium budgets, the directors have come, and I think Frances was the first one, who said, we figured out a structure of how to bill boards and I understand any surplus money is gone and that structure had to change. I'm not asking, because you may only be here for three months, you guys come and go pretty quick, and I understand that. That's state government. But, I guess I am very leery of what is going to be next. And you can't answer that. You don't have the authority to answer what is going to be next. That comes from the Finance Cabinet or somebody up there. I just want to go on record as saying that I have a philosophical objection, and whether we sign the MOA or not, we're going to be charged the money. But, philosophically, I will vote, and maybe it's the hippie in me from being so old, but I just feel like that at some point somebody has got to say wait a minute, this just doesn't make sense to have this big of an increase." Courtney Bourne responded, "I think this goes back to establishing the most equitable fashion. Unfortunately for this Board it was much harder hit to bring it up to par with the amount of attention it required, the receipts, the licensees, the factors that went into the calculation. Unfortunately, based on this formula, the board hadn't pulled its weight. On the other side of that, 20 some boards went up. Twenty some boards fees were raised. So, there were other boards who also won't balance that out. I understand that you are concerned about the increases to come and you want to rebel against the price, but, you're right, with or without the contract with the Board here, the fees are going to come anyway. The only thing is that the contract is here now to be signed before the July 1 date, because that is when the auditor's office said you have to have these contracts in place." Angela Evans interjected, "Not to cut you off, but the way I read the audit was that it was recommended that the fees be regulated and rightfully so, but I didn't read where it was a requirement." Ms. Bourne interjected, "I can have our Cabinet attorney contact Mr. Ryan." Ms. Evans interjected, "You are just using the audit as a reason and the audit is just a recommendation." Ms. Bourne stated, "I will have the Cabinet attorney address this and we'll go from there." Ms. Evans said, "I was just pointing that out. That it is not a requirement. I have talked with Latasha Bruckner. It is something that everyone wants to have and thinks should happen, but it is not a requirement. It will be taken out of the budget. I'm just clarifying that." Ms. Bourne said, "Our attorney said that we cannot move forward without the contracts in place, so we will have them clear that up." Richard Hamon stated, "I wasn't here at the last meeting and missed some of the background and I haven't been with the Board as long as Tony has, but I can kind of see what is going on and maybe can offer a little clarification. As a therapist I am pretty use to listening to problems and complaints and watching the interactions happen, and your job as a therapist is to try and find out what is underneath that all, to try to identify the pattern or the pink elephant in the room and sometimes that is a hard thing to talk about. What I am perceiving is that the problem here is that these conscientious and hardworking board members who take a lot of pride in their board are feeling like this is an arbitrary, kind of unfair pronouncement about the changes that are going to or are taking place that instead of something that might reward their hard work. It seems to be a slap in the face. I think there is a suspicion that it's not arbitrary and it is not fair and the form that was presented to explain this may or may not stand up under scrutiny. I feel like that no one here, and tell me if I'm wrong, really has a strong sense that okay, this makes sense, you know, and this is fair and therefore, in all honesty I can condone this or I can support this. I feel that people are just kind of stuck there. And I guess I am wondering what it will take to move us from that position to a place of understanding and support." Mr. Watkins said, "I appreciate that Richard. Let me reframe that. There is a lack of trust because, I see the formula and I can't help but wonder how arbitrary is it? But, Tom Robbins asked last month, and is also one of the issues for me as a board member is the whole

scanning of records. Where did that come in? Three years ago? And we have records kind of out in limbo and we're paying administrative fees that, and we agreed that that was a great move to make, but then things get stuck, and when you are paying for services, and we celebrated when they went down in 2010 because yeah, that is great! But, it is more than just a number, it's also unmet fulfillment, unmet promises, at least from where I sit, that I've seen over the past seven years. I just want to be upfront with everybody about that too. It's not just the number." Ms. Bourne stated, "I understand that before my time, there was a limbo period, as you said, in the scanning situation, but that has been resolved. The administrators are back up and scanning. So your records are stored both electronically and physically. Just in my time alone, each administrator is able to scan. Of the boxes that were a disarray of records that were upstairs are now here in individual rooms, very organized, very labeled. If you were to say, produce for me this application, from this date with all the last names of W, we would be able to do that in a fairly reasonable amount of time." Ms. Miller stated, "That that is good to know because it has been that once it has been scanned, it might as well have been thrown away as far as we were concerned because we were not able to obtain that document again and that caused us a lot of delays." Jane Prouty asked if the scanning was finished. Ms. Bourne responded, "No. It is ongoing." Ms. Prouty stated that she understood that it was ongoing but up to today, this week, is everything finished? Ms. Bourne said, "No. When I got here they were not scanning and there is a back load of scanning to be done but they are now scanning again and moving forward." Ms. Prouty asked, "Who is in charge of scanning?" Ms. Bourne stated, "It started with Susan Ellis. They looked at the most efficient way to be able to have all administrators be able to scan and on her team she has someone who covers the web, database, the technological part of it all and he looked up the software components and the hardware components and looked at what we were going to need. These are all things that occur again behind the scenes which is beyond what Marcia does for this board. That gentleman worked together with Ms. Day and they wrote out the policy procedures, step by step, how each administrator will know to do the same procedure. What documents are needed to be scanned? Together with her whole team, they worked together with the KDLA over the last several months to figure out what was necessary to keep, which documents needed to be saved for how long. Do you keep this application packet for five years, 15 years, how long do you physically hang on to this before those records are destroyed? So, scanning itself is a much, much, much larger picture once you get through the KDLA." Jane Prouty asked, "What does the KDLA know about how long the Board feels we need to keep specific information about licensees? What do they know about that? Does anybody on the board know this?" Ms. Evans stated, "That is part of what needs to be communicated because that is part of the law and retention and how to locate things." Ms. Bourne stated that she didn't know specifically about what the MFT board needed compared to other boards. Ms. Prouty stated that the MFT Board needed to have input. Angela Evans stated, "KDLA creates categories and there are certain categories of records that have to be kept permanently. There are some that need to be kept for a period of time. There are some that you can destroy as soon as you use them. But it is up to the Board and I think that at some point at least some of my boards dictate what was either established based on KDLA. It is part of your all's right, authority, obligation, duty to change that. To communicate with them you need to indicate that you want these records kept for five years." Ms. Prouty stated. "That was an example of what could come back and bite us later because it will all be institutionalized and then we'll get it and we'll say this isn't what we need and we're going to have a lawsuit and we'll say those records were determined by the KDLA and will not be useful. That is my concern. Now going back, I wasn't here last time but I totally endorse what you said Richard. I thought it was very well put. The lack of trust, and then, I don't know if you have ever been in a position or perhaps where we're out there practicing, we are confronted on a daily basis with our licensees. And believe me they know that we are on the Board. We will be crucified; we will be crucified by our licensees if we sign this MOA without protest. We will be crucified!" Courtney Bourne responded, "And I think that is something that

needs to be reflected in your minutes. I want to go back to a couple of questions. What is the lack of trust? The lack of trust in the validity of the past fees established?" Ms. Prouty responded, "Nobody asked us for input on this whole budget process." Sandra Miller stated, "The board wishes they could have reviewed this budget before it was approved and to have had some input. Instead, we don't see or hear anything about it until you come to us with the MOA." Ms. Prouty stated, "And that is the parallel with the scanning." Ms. Ellis pulled out a memo that went out from Shannon when the budget was being created. Angela Evans stated, "That memo from Shannon that each Board member got, it was a question of big changes that would be coming up. Did you all perceive any big change coming up in the next year and to let her know as they were working on the budget? It wasn't presented as if the fee was going to drastically change or if something drastically changes we are going to come back to you." Sandra Miller stated, "That was the only question asked and the Board didn't see any drastic changes coming other than travel, etc. which is the norm." Tony Watkins interjected, "For example, your husband comes in one day and says, 'Honey, here is the new budget.' Courtney laughs and states that Tony knows her husband. Tony asked, "I do? Oh, are you married to Ed? I didn't know that!" Courtney stated that is why the analogy was kind of funny! Tony laughed and said Ed would never do that. The analogy is still there. I am being paid \$100 a day to attend to Board business and I am losing \$100 a day by being here." Jane Prouty said, "An hour. We are losing a \$100 an hour by being here." Courtney Bourne stated, "Neither I nor none of the staff which serve this Board can even begin to imagine losing \$100 hour." Tony Watkins stated, "I do this, which is an investment of my time and my life because I care. I care about our profession and making sure that we are protecting the public. I feel like what we do is kind of usurped and that we're not involved in the process of what affects what we do and how we can do our job, it's kind of like my boss or my wife coming in and saying, Oh, here's how we're going to do things from now on. I have this reaction and we just naturally push back as much as I understand that the surplus money is not there. It's also just the fact that nobody said here's where we're moving and here are the changes." Jane Prouty said, "If I had known these percents, these three factors, when Shannon presented that, I would have looked at them as a person who runs a business and I would say, Number of licensees, can't change that; total receipts, since its based on what the Kentucky government is going to pay their people. We have no control over the lease of this building, we have no control over the office supplies, well we do have some, we have no control over computer services, no control over telephone, no control over janitorial. We have no control over any of that. As a business owner, I would have looked, set all of those aside because we have no control over them. What do we have control over? We have control over how much of her time we use, and supplies. And as a business owner I would have said, I would have made some different choices. When Marcia, in her graciousness, will say, I will be happy to do that, I would have, as the owner, said, 'Marcia, you're not going to do that. You are not going to do it that way. We're going to do it this way because it will take less of your time.' I would have made that decision back when, whatever the date of that memo is, we would have implemented that on that day. Right now we are told that this is what it is and probably for the next two years, this is what it is. So, in effect, even what we do for the next two years isn't going to affect the two little things that we could have actually changed." Courtney Bourne replied, "But, moving forward, say they go to Marcia as the Board Administrator, when they prepare the next budget and she says, Oh, well they have made things more efficient, and I am using less time or I found all of the expired licensees and we got them all to renew and we're way up. You know, any type of things that happen"...Ms. Prouty interjects, "licenses are not going to change...that's not something we can change..." Ms. Bourne continues, "or changes that do occur, any flexibility that there is, you know you are going to be in the same pattern when they form the next budget in October of 2013, so any changes that happen now anything could impact the formula they use in 2013 so it could impact them. So I think you always strive to run as efficient business as you can." Jane stated, "My experience is, and speak up if you have a different experience, if we accept 58,000 and some change without protest, the likelihood that that is going to

move down significantly in the future is very slim. Very slim. These things, salaries, leases, utilities, equipment, computer services, telephone services, these things are not going to decrease in cost; they are going to increase in costs. Okay, so we are saying if we accept this without protest, we're saying yeah, we'll buy into that and when those costs go up that 58,000 is going to go up." Ms. Bourne responded, "I think that you have, I certainly see the point that you are making about protesting, about making sure that you're on the record to say, we got this, we're stuck with it but we are going to fight it. I think there is a due diligence that you have to your licensees, to your profession and with your concern, I would advise, and I am not your advisor, but to help go on the record and have it noted that you were responsible Board members. We entered into this contract, it has within it a 30 day clause that within 30 days you can negate the contract, it can be over with, and we can break the contract with written notice. How about you form a committee that says we want to seriously look at, are we getting our bang for our buck? Can we run this board for less? And you may find that you can hire an administrator, a director, a web analyst, your accounting systems, you may find that you can have that for less." Tony Watkins said, "We can outsource it to Taiwan, or we can join another Board. I don't want to cause you heartburn, that is not my point here. What if we refuse to sign the MOA? Are they going to kick us out?" Ms. Bourne responded, "It is my understanding from my Cabinet attorneys that we cannot proceed with services without the MOA beginning July 1st. It was something that was brought to light because of the audit a year ago and it is a contract that says we will provide your services and vice versa and what is expected of us. I think that should be in the minutes. Basically, if you don't sign it, O & P won't provide the services." Jane Prouty asked it that is what will happen. Ms. Bourne said, "I don't know for sure. I can go back to our Cabinet attorneys, and I probably should have had one of them here, in fact I can call and get one to come down." Jane Prouty said, "That would be great. Give them a chance to confer because we don't want something off the cuff and have them answer and later say oh, we made a mistake." Angela Evans said, "The money is going to be taken out regardless." Sandra Miller stated, "If the money is going to be taken out, they should provide the services but we need to know what the attorney says." Jane Prouty asked if we could table this and come back to it later in the meeting and give Ms. Bourne a chance to contact the attorney. Courtney asked how long the meeting would last. Sandra Miller responded that the meeting would last at least another hour. Courtney Bourne stated, "Let me call down to the cabinet and see if an attorney is available to speak to you about this and depending on what they say, maybe we can get back together in June. I will report back if an attorney is available to meet with you and if you will be able to meet with them at that time. Thank you. Okay, what about, in the meantime, are there other questions that have not been answered that when we come back, is there other information we can bring forth for you?" Tony Watkins said, "I would like to have access to, if I knew there was parity among the boards, if it was even Stevens then I would feel better about it." Courtney Bourne asked, "Are you looking like you want other boards to pay the same costs?" Tony said, "According to this formula that everybody is suffering the same. I would just feel better when I start getting the phone calls, if we do end up having to raise fees. I turned to the guy from the professional association that was at the meeting last month who was here representing the professional association so that they can report to the licensees, I want them to know, you have no idea how much crap we take. Period! And since I've been on the Board, I have done my very best to be as transparent and communicate openly with professionals, the licensees, even though we don't answer them, we're not responsible to them, we do affect them in a great way and I know we've talked of the three legs of the budget, but I can't look at them and say, "Look, it hit every board equally." Courtney said, "And you are right, because it doesn't hit every board equally because some boards were already paying close to the cost that is most equitable based from the formula. So, boards that were closer to the number they were going to be at might have only taken 40% versus 140%, so in a sense, it's not." Tony stated, "I'm not saying that everyone needed to go up 140%, I'm just saying that if there's another board with similar license requirements, CEU's, 700 licensees but

they are only paying \$30,000, I would really want to know, where's the \$29,000 difference." Jane Prouty stated, "One of the issues that we don't have a lot of facts on is the cycle of receipts. It says that ours is annualized at \$96,000. Okay, so what was the total cost on salaries, what was the total cost on the lease of the building, utilities, office supplies and then I would want to see on the other two boards and staff time, we need to take a percentage there. Is our percentage of that total cost, which I think is one million two, right? Is that the percentage? I think it says here that total receipts for all boards are \$2,062,000. Someone who is good at math make sure I am saying this right, so our percentage is 4.67%. So who decided it was 4.67%? What is that based on? Maybe that is the average of 6 of the staff time which is 6.17% plus the percent of licensee's is 2.9%. Maybe that is an average of those two." Tony stated, "My understanding is the 4.67% is our percent of the \$1.2 million we bring in." Courtney Bourne stated that the receipts are the receipts incoming. Jane Prouty said, "That's incoming so do we know what staff salaries, leases, utilities, what all those costs are? The total of that? Do we have that number? What is that number?" Susan Ellis responded, "If you add the 2.93% for your licensees and your 6.17% for your percentage of staff time, and your 4.67% of your annual receipts, it gives you the total of 13.77%". Jane said, "And that's how you came up with the \$58,000, I'm pretty sure." Susan responded, "Yes. The amount that O & P needs to operate, the \$1,282,000, was divided by that 13.77% and that's how we came out with the 4.59% which is your \$58,900. Those three were added together and then divided by the total amount O & P needs to operate and that's how we came up with the \$58,900." Angela Evans stated, "I think she was asking how you came up with the \$1.2 million." Susan Ellis said, "That is the operating budget. That is the total to operate O & P. That includes personnel and our operating expenses." Sandra Miller asked, "Is there a way to get an itemized list of that in dollars and not in percentages for those of us who are not mathematicians. I think that may help us to see the whole picture. I would like to know, how much money you spend on salaries, how much money you spend on utilities, etc." Discussion on percent's versus money. Jane stated, "The percent's seem high. How many boards are there?" Courtney Bourne stated, "It takes a numbers person to figure this and it is over my head as well. They don't pay me to come up with budgets. I'm not in the budget office. But it's not 13% of 100, it's 13% of about I want to say 800%." Jane asked where the 800% came from. Courtney responded it's the total percent. Tony said it was new math. Susan Ellis stated, "That trying to explain this if you are not a numbers person is overwhelming. Each part of the formula, the percentages of licensees, the percentages of annual receipts and the percentage of the Board Administrator time is 300% when we go to put all the formulas together. So instead of having 100% we have 300%." Jane Prouty said, "So they are weighted equally?" Courtney Bourne asked Susan to show the spreadsheet to Jane and Tony so they can follow it better. Tony stated, "Here is where his lack of trust comes in too because its government, is there any money built into this that goes back into the general fund to help with retirement? I know they had to sell \$70 million dollars with of property last year. That is a yes or no answer." Susan stated, "As far as sweeps for the division, we're not scheduled to have any for 2013-2014." Tony said, "Okay, but this \$1.2 million operating cost is only for what it takes O & P to operate? None of it goes to supplement retirement?" Susan stated, "Included in our Personnel cost is health insurance, retirement for employees, life insurance; that is all included and of our \$1.2 million budget, almost \$900,000 is employee expenses. Janitor expenses, attorney fees that we have to use from the cabinet are included in that." Tony stated, "So, about \$300,000 is the operating expenses?" Susan said. "We are very bare bones. If you go up and look at our supplies, there is not an ample amount. We order once a week or every two weeks so there is not extra stuff that we order." Courtney stated, "Not only that, we have employees who come in and purchase their own personal furniture to make their offices look nicer. They purchase their own paint. It's not part of the extras that we do. We have people to come in and paint their own offices, etc." Ms. Miller stated, "We all understand that. We've all worked for non-profits." Angela Evans said, "I have to ask this question or I don't feel like I would be doing my job if I didn't. That \$1.2 is now, based on not having

that extra money that was in the reserve?" Susan stated, "As of FY 12 we are expected to have \$38,000 carry forward. That is all we are going to have." Angela said, "What I'm going to is that it has been projected that you need \$1.2 to operate." Courtney responded, "That \$1.2 million has not been a steady number since 2004. She is asking about the general fund which has not been used, O & P has not been given General Fund monies in the budget since 2004. They didn't just stop giving general funds monies this upcoming biennial budget." Angela stated, "I understood that but, she hasn't asked her question yet because I think what I want, the board needs to know or needs to ask is 'What has O & P been operating on? What is that budget?' Has it been \$1.2 million in the past?" Susan Ellis responded no, that it changes from year to year. Angela Evans said, "I thought that was something that might make boards feel more comfortable to see what you are saying, what has been the expenses, what has O & P been operating on in the past or to see what the increase has gradually been to see why operating cost have come to \$1.2 million now." Tony Watkins stated, "Yeah, if we can see an upward 4.2% increase annually then that would help make more sense of this." Susan stated, "There have been two board administrators added in the past three years. We've added an IT person to handle all the websites and the technology in house that wasn't here before. That was added two years ago. We added another fiscal person, who is on medical leave right now. That is part of why the increase has gone up." Sandy Miller stated, "That is what we asked for. A breakdown of the numbers. Now and in the past. What we have spent." Angela stated, "It is a repeat question and each Board is going to be asking that question which helps push this along. This is what we had before. This is what we are operating on. This was the cushion we had to help supplement. We don't have that cushion anymore. This is what we need now from each board." Jane stated, "Although it might seem like we are challenging you all, that for me, I need to understand this so when I get asked I can say, 'Look, at one point it didn't make sense to me. They have since explained it to me and now it makes sense.' Or, look, these are the numbers and this is how and this is why and feel good about that, that I have done due diligence." Tony stated, "And I agree, this is not an indictment on the staff. I understand how crap rolls downhill. I know they are dealing with their required jobs, but it goes back to say, we have this nice open relationship and we collaborate. And if I tell somebody that I understand and to trust me, like you, they are going to trust me." Jane Prouty agreed and said they do that because we do the work. Sandy stated, "We want to be able to give them an informed answer and not say well this is what they told me." Courtney asked Susan to show them the spreadsheet. The Board took a break and Susan explained the spreadsheet to Sandy Miller. Susan asked, "Is this the itemized information? Is this what you are looking for? It shows the total personnel cost. Total operating cost. You will see the salaries. The subtotal shows the regular salaries, fica tax, insurance, health insurance for us. Then all state agencies are required to pay workers compensation, other personnel costs. Those would be where we have janitors, legal services from our cabinet, that's all included in the personnel. Then we have the utilities, electric, water, sewer, maintenance of computers, building maintenance, telephone services, travel (we usually don't have any travel because O & P staff doesn't go anywhere unless the Boards ask them too and then their travel is paid by the Boards.) Then we have a miscellaneous category in case something comes up." Sandra asked what would go under miscellaneous. Susan asked Janet what went under Miscellaneous. Susan said it was \$16,000 and she was trying to think what went under there. Susan Ellis will go look it up and see what the specifics went into that \$16,000. Usually if we have any extra and we know we can pay for it in one place or the other on the spreadsheet. Most of our budget is based on the salaries. And if you want to see how this is calculated, here is what you paid last year. That's the number of licensees as of July [2011](#). That is the percentage of the total amount of licensees of all of the boards, Marcia's time at 50%, annualized receipts where it fits in the total receipts for O & P. and then the 13.77% is those three added and divided by the \$1.2 million that comes out to the \$58,800." Sandra said, "If Marcia gets another board added, and we're one of three boards, will it still be 50%?" Susan Ellis responded, "This budget is set for two years. In the next

budget cycle, if we stay with this formula, we will go to each of them again and say, "Tell me how much time you spend on each of one of your Boards." Sandra stated, "I am concerned with what would happen if Marcia got additional boards. Right now there are no problems with communication with the licensees from the administration, etc. Phone calls returned, etc. We want to be sure that doesn't change. That's what we are worried about. If she has to split her time more what will happen? We've had a couple of administrators that had to double up when we lost a Board Administrator. Marcia knows our board and knows what they need and she is able to respond to them which make a much more efficient use of her time too."

Break. Courtney Bourne returned and informed the Board that Peter Ervin from the Cabinet is on his way over. The Board will work further into the agenda until he arrives.

Courtney Bourne introduced the Director of Legal Services from the Cabinet, Peter Ervin and stated that he will help answer some of the questions that she has had. We will resume our discussion. Ms. Miller stated that the primary question was, "If we did not sign the MOA, what would happen?" Mr. Ervin replied, "Well, I guess at some point there would have to be a standoff. The MOA is required to be in place. That is one of the things that came out of the audit. It began with the relationship of BPE but it includes the Office of O & P. And that is an MOA. A Memorandum of Agreement is a design and not a contract by design because I think of a contract as being a reflection of an arm's length agreement between people of competing parties. This is not a contract. This is a Memorandum of Agreement because we're sister agencies functioning under the same government. If there is a quote 'breach' if you will, or a failure to perform under the terms of the MOA, O & P is not going to sue your membership and your membership is not going to sue O & P. But, we're going to have to come to the table to resolve a problem. And that is what we are required to do in government. But, because there is an exchange of funds in relationship to services provided with the MOA agreement, that is why the auditor says we must reflect not only what services are going to be provided, but the amount that is going to be charged for those services. So we have to have it. We have to have the MOA. If you don't sign it, like I said, there will at some point have to be a standoff where we say, we can't continue to provide the services because without the written reflection of the compensations we've made for services provided." Ms. Miller asked, "Does that mean that if we don't sign, the money won't be taken out and distributed to"... Mr. Ervin interjected, "that if the services weren't provided, I don't think we could justify taking the money." Ms. Miller asked if there were any other questions. Angela Evans stated, "I want, and this is just me talking, it is not the Attorney General's office talking, as I pointed out to Courtney was that the audit and I certainly understand the desire and the need for things to be in writing, but the audit made it a recommendation as opposed to saying, an MOA must be drafted. I think that position we all understand, that something should be in writing, but the audit itself didn't say it must be." Mr. Ervin stated, "We read the audit to require that there be a written MOA when services are provided in exchange for compensation. That is the way we read the audit. Without regard to that reading, as you said, it is understood that this thing should be reflected in writing, signed and sealed." Angela stated, "I am not arguing it but, understanding that the MOA is a new thing for O & P and again understanding that something should be in writing, if it did come to that kind of standoff, I'm wondering if something else couldn't be put in writing minus that fee or have something else drafted, because again, the offices have operated for years without one in place, so it's possible and it can be done, even though that might not be the best practice, and I think we all agree that it isn't the best practice, but the fact that it has been done before, based on a situation where there might be a standoff if that...is there another option?" Mr. Ervin stated, "If we are all in agreement that it is not the best practice and the best practice is to have a written agreement, why is there a question about executing the written agreement?" Angela stated, "That because there is an issue with the fee." Mr. Ervin asked, "What is the issue with the fee? The fee is not something that we have any direct

control over. It is set by the Office of Budget. It's not something that we can negotiate. It's already been set. It's been adopted by the legislature. It's a fee developed in as equitable way as we know to distribute the cost of operating this office among the various boards that it serves. It's as equitably done as we know how to do it. The only resource of funding for O & P is what these Boards pay. They don't get general funds. It's as equitable as we know. I understand and I appreciate your responsibility to your memberships to guard the purse strings. That is half of your role on this Board I would think. But this is a sister government agency, it is not trying to cheat, it is not trying to take advantage, but is trying to make an equitable distribution. In 2007, the Board paid \$37,000, in 2011 they paid \$24,000. You know, it fluctuates. It fluctuates in part on the need of the Board. I appreciate again your responsibility. You're looking at doubling, more than doubling your fee. I appreciate the shock value that that has. But it is a reflection of that equitable distribution, it's a reflection of the fact that maybe if you were paying \$37,000 in '07 and \$24,000 last year, that you weren't paying what it cost to administer this Board, or at least not in relationship to what everybody else shared. And that's what the present budget is intended to reflect. It is an equitable share among all Boards. That's the whole purpose of the creation of O & P was to admit all of the Boards, some of which who are better able than others, but to let all the Boards share the cost of operation. And any individual Board seeking independence from that process, even among the better funding ones, is likely to incur substantial increase in cost. The concept still makes sense for everybody involved."

Tony Watkins stated that we were talking to Courtney earlier and like the illustration I used with her was, what if your husband came home tomorrow and said, 'Oh, guess what, you're going to get \$10 a week to spend rather than \$50 a week you had been getting and the rub and the lack of trust is there. I don't know, I don't talk to the other Boards but I do have friends on the other Boards, but I think what it really comes down to is the systemic lack of communication from the top down. And I, it's not something that Courtney has control over, she's in a position to execute what, you know her duties are driven by the Secretary, so it is just moving forward. I think that this may be a good lesson to maybe memorialize...we've got to have better communication." Mr. Ervin said, "I agree 100% and I apologized for any failure with that communication because it's like I said, we're a sister agency. It's not our money; it's not your agencies money in the end either. There is no effort to pull the wool over anyone's eyes or to cheat anybody, but a failure of communication, a failure of transparency, breeds distrust and that's what we don't want and that's what we don't need. So, we do want to take that message and avoid any appearance of that in the future." Tony Watkins stated, "I have been on the Board for seven years and when I came on, there was a great deal of disdain for the Board from the licensees. In fact, the perception was that we were the police; we were out to catch somebody, the enemy. And Jane pointed this out. My integrity is probably the most important thing to me and I carry that as a Board member when I go out into the public; people know that if I say you can trust me on this, typically they will trust me. But I can't say trust me on this when I don't know, when it seems like it is cloak and dagger, you know, it is behind the doors, and stuff going on and all of a sudden, 'Here, 141% increase guys. Good luck with that.' It was a raw rub." Mr. Ervin stated, "I understand." He stated he had a similar question from one of the Boards the other day where they asked, "What am I getting for this extra \$30,000?" He responded, "Very good question. And it's not one where I can pipe up and say, you are getting X, Y and Z. Because the likelihood is I want to believe and I have confidence that between Courtney's leadership and having people like Deb Day and Susan Ellis, that the quality of the service that you receive is in fact better. I think that having a new administrator coming on board, having BPE going somewhere else, I think that your individual administrator is now going to have greater time. Now, does that equate to 140% increase? Of course it doesn't. The cost benefit analysis doesn't add up. But what does add up and what we ask you to accept and what I believe the transparency now with all the numbers is what it amounts to is an equitable distribution among each of the Boards that O & P serves. And that is what our main effort is, to cause that to be what it is. So in terms of a cost benefit analysis, I can't say you are getting another \$40,000 worth but

I can say you are getting the same benefit for your dollar that every other board in O & P is getting.” Jane Prouty said, “One of the things that could help with transparency, that I don’t think we have a handle on is the \$1.2 million operating budget. And that could, you said, we could come to a standoff. I would hate to see that but one of the things that would help me overcome that perspective is to understand how much are salaries, what’s the total salary number, what does this building cost, utilities, totals in those categories because that is something we can’t really control. It is what it is, but it would be very helpful for me to be able to go back to licensees and say, ‘Look, it cost this place \$1.2 million to operate and this is how it is broken down. And that makes sense to me.” Mr. Ervin said, “You can get you a copy of the budget.” Jane said that would be helpful. Angela Evans interjected, “That is something that has been requested, going back to the distrust issue.” Mr. Ervin said, “That is available to this board and anyone individual who wants it. That is a matter of public record. We would be more than happy to get that to you.” Ms. Miller asked if there were any more questions and told Mr. Ervin that the Board appreciates your input. Mr. Ervin thanked everyone and offered his availability for any other questions that the Board might have. Mr. Ervin stated, “We do need the agreement. I don’t think there is much to be argued about what the content is. Again it gets back to, it’s not something that anybody is going to sue or be sued. It is a matter of formality.” Jane Prouty stated, “I don’t want to repeat too much and waste everyone’s time but from this standpoint, and I don’t know if you understand this, there was a memo when Shannon was here where she asked us for input. It needs to be noted that what this board understood of what she was asking us for was, “Are there going to be any significant increases in what you guys are going to be doing? Are you going to any big conferences that we don’t know about and if so we need to know those numbers? That was what we thought she was asking us for. Other than that, we had no input, no understanding of the formula, how the Board could affect that and what exactly those pieces were so that we could look...I run a small business...so that we could look at what are the costs that we can’t change, what are the costs we can change and let’s get started changing them. We weren’t given that opportunity. That seems like we are not viewed as a partner.” Mr. Ervin stated, “That gets back to the fact that it’s not a negotiable item for us either. Our budget comes from the same source that your budget comes from and what we did was give that budgeting authority our cost of operation. That is all we did. And then this formula was developed to create an equitable distribution of that cost of operation among the boards involved. It’s not a matter of us being able to sit down with this board and 22 other boards and say, ‘How can we work with you to reduce this number here or that number there.’ I don’t see that occurring.” Jane Prouty stated, “It would have affected our formula outcome.” Mr. Ervin asked, “How would it affect the formula of your membership, the time your administrator uses?... Jane interjected, “That’s what we could affect.” Mr. Ervin asked, “Would the Board want to reduce the services that are provided?” Jane stated, “We could use other ways of meeting goals. I mean, if you have a choice of having an administrator send out letters, which is a costly thing in time and money, versus putting something up on the web? We would have a one-time cost. We could do that. We might have made different choices.” Tony Watkins interjected; “We could go to an annual renewal instead of monthly.” Jane interjected, “We could renew every three years. There are a number of things that we could have done that would significantly reduce that time. And that is one of the few things we could do.” Mr. Ervin said, “The time involved is part of it, I guess we can let that be known from this point forward. To the extent you all develop the means of using less time that will reduce your share of the formula. But, in the end, what the budget is going to do is reflect an equitable distribution among all the parties.” Angela Evans stated, “I think the one sentence you said that I think clears up a lot for everybody is that the budget process was that O & P talked to the budget person, and this is what it cost to run O & P and then figure out what each board has to pay. That message was never relayed, that number was never relayed to the Boards, so that fact that they did not know that was the process and what number was being sent to the budget office, that goes back to the trust in the issue, and I think had they been informed that this is the big number that we are

dealing with; because we no longer have this cushion; because of whatever else, I think that would have kind of nipped the issue with the Board. I think, that was another glitch that wasn't understood." Mr. Ervin stated, "I hope that we've addressed that now and I suggest in the future we be more transparent, but that is the way it has to be because as I said, O & P doesn't have any other resources than these boards. It is the cost of operation equitably distributed among the boards it serves. One of the factors that are used in determining that equitable distribution is the amount of time, and I hope you will agree it makes perfect sense, is the amount of time the administrator uses in serving the Board. Tony Watkins stated, "I can tell you the one positive I have seen in seven years as far as service delivery, and this is what we hear from our licensees, is when they call here, somebody is here to answer the phone. And their e-mails are responded to within 24 hours and that makes a huge difference and she is overly nice, and to accommodating, but I'd rather her have that than the other, and we're always saying, come on, you have to set firmer boundaries but that is just her personality, her nature and I wouldn't want to change her for anything. Statements were made that Marcia is very helpful. Tony continued, "And we can change regulations if we need too. I know you don't have the magic wand either." Mr. Ervin stated, "I wish I could and tell you that you will get another administrator for your \$40,000 but I can't say that. But, I can represent what I have and I hope that it makes sense to you and to the method of operation of government." Tony Watkins stated, "Courtney, I feel sorry for you, and I feel like you were kind of thrown into the lion's den. You haven't been here that long and this came along a long time before you got here." Mr. Ervin stated, "There is a baptism process and you have to get through a session of it, and you learn, and Courtney's learning, I'm learning and the whole idea behind it is that we're all going to do better and we need to be held accountable to do better too. We need to be held accountable to demonstrate lesson learned." Sandra Miller thanked Mr. Ervin for coming to the meeting.

Sandra Miller asked for a motion to sign or not sign the MOA. Tony Watkins stated, "Before we take a vote, this changes perspective for me and I still somehow want it noted that we did our due diligence to get explanations and I don't think that not signing it and interrupting services serves the public or our licensees. We can look seriously at other options, and think we should, and we may find out we are getting a deal at twice the cost." Sandra Miller stated that we won't know until we look. Tony reminded everyone that we have a 30 day out. We can give a 30 day notice and be out of the agreement. It also doesn't have to be signed until July 1st or by our next Board meeting scheduled for June 28. Jane Prouty stated, "But there has been an agreement, a willingness to provide some information that I believe we should get." Sandra Miller informed Board members that while they were out that she had the opportunity to look at the breakdown, salaries, how they pay the rent, etc. Jane Prouty said. I would like to see the spreadsheet. I think we ought to have a copy of it. I understand a lot better. What was presented explains a lot more than what I understood last night. I still think that for our licensees we ought to acknowledge or validate that we are signing the MOA under protest due to the lack of opportunity to review and gain understanding of the final budget prior to its submission for approval because that hasn't changed. Some of the other stuff has changed for me." Sandra asked, "Does entering that into the minutes going to go as our notification to the licensees that we were signing under protest because that is probably the only way they are going to see what was done." Jane Prouty stated, "That as far as the licensee's, probably yes, but by putting it on the MOA, which if I understand the process, the MOA goes to, where does it end up?" Angela Evans stated that it ended up with the secretary. Jane continued, "that it goes through these other groups so that these people, I mean O & P people, can say, look, we've got to have more information from you guys and it would give them, say, we had a Board who said this, and go and look at their MOA, they said it right on their MOA, so that it would give them some authority as in which to ask more questions, and not be viewed as disrespectful. You don't want to be viewed as disrespectful or oppositional, but you do want to be viewed as doing due diligence." Tony Watkins stated, "That the

fact that Mr. Ervin showed up today is not going to get the message across that we feel that there is a lack of trust, a lack of transparency, we have great concerns so maybe right now we don't vote on the MOA. Or, we vote to add the suggested language to the MOA and that it will come back with that language in the MOA and we will vote to approve it at the next meeting. Plus we have three members missing today." Jane Prouty stated that she would like to have everybody here before we sign the MOA. Richard Hamon stated that so many people have such strong feelings about the MOA by the questions. Everyone needs to be here. Sandra Miller asked for a motion. She stated she heard suggestions for a motion but no motion was made. Tony Watkins made a motion to table the vote until next month when the other three members, almost half the board, are here. Sandra Miller asked if the requested language should be added in this motion. Angela Evans stated, "That should be in a separate motion. It is something that could take place at the next meeting. You need to have something prepared because I'm unsure about printing it on the MOA. The Board needs to indicate that there is an attachment because the MOA itself is just for services. I think you can indicate your protest or your dissatisfaction, you will just indicate there is an attachment to the MOA and have an official statement where you can indicate an there is an attachment." Jane Prouty stated that nothing gets attention like something written on a contract after the fact. Nothing gets attention like that. Discussion followed. Angela suggested that you sign it and put a statement, "Note, please see attached statement of protest." Sandra Miller asked for a second to the motion. Jane Prouty seconded the motion. The motion carried.

Attorney Report

The Public Meeting to be held on May 23, 2012 was cancelled due to no participants.

On June 12, 2012 a meeting of the Administrative Regulations Review Subcommittee in regard to 201 KAR 32:035 will meet at 1:00 p.m. in Room 149 of the Capitol Annex. Chair Sandra Miller and Attorney Angela Evans will attend. Anyone else that would like to attend is invited to do so.

There were several typo's in the new forms. Corrections need to be sent to Marcia Egbert so she can have Jeff Boler make the corrections.

Ms. Evans reported that one Board was bothered that they got the RFP after the fact. Ms. Evans stated that the Board doesn't have to sign. The Board requested that they be able to review the RFP 45 before they go out in the future in case the Board wants to make changes.

Old Business

Tony Watkins talked with Jeff Boler in regard to the ability of posting a newsletter on the website, distribution/RFP's and procedure to get Auto Responders on our website. Mr. Boler informed him that we can do newlsetters and e-mail blasts using automated response.

Sandy Miller will be sending out information on Telehealth.

Tony Watkins reported that he still has not been able to make contact with UK in regard to the KY Law and Supervision courses they are providing. He will try to get with them before the next Board Meeting.

Jane Prouty stated that she had talked to Jenny Schiller and she is willing to do one training. She would need guidelines on what it would include i.e. handouts and discussion, sample case. She also asked if the Board if they knew that Vern Rickert was doing a training on KY Law. The Board is unaware of this. Ms. Schiller wanted to know if she could contact Attorney Angela Evans regarding

putting curriculum together and if she could present the training through PRES or KMF. Ms. Prouty will inform Ms. Schiller that she can contact Ms. Evans and that the Board was not aware that Vern Rickert was doing training on KY Law.

Richard Hamon reported on background checks. He stated that the Board needs to make them affordable. He will check with AOC about them putting us on their dropdown list.

Tony Watkins reported that Tom Robbins made recommendations that the Board delete some sections of the regulations around CEU requirements and reduce the requirement to 9 hours with 3 hours being in Ethics and all nine of the hours must be systemic to Marriage and Family Therapy. He said this would include the Associates in the nine hour requirement. He will further develop his recommendation and bring it to the next Board meeting.

Jane Prouty presented a draft letter she created to be used when returning an application packet that has been received without all required materials. A few changes were made. The letter is ready for use.

New Business

The Board reviewed the COAMFTE – Notice of Actions – Spring 2012. Informational. No further action.

The Board received an e-mail from Margaret Hazlette regarding Social Work Board documents that indicate that some individuals may be practicing as a Marriage and Family Therapist without a license. Tony Watkins will investigate and report back to the Board.

The Board received an e-mail from Cheryl Elam wanting to know if an LMFT can administer testing if education and training is in place, like the LPC's can per their regulations. The answer to her question is "yes, if you have the training."

The Board received a letter from Troyann Gentile with questions about using Skype hours. She must cease and desist and re-apply with a new Plan of Supervision. No further action was taken.

The Board received an e-mail from Emma Sterrett requesting AAFMT – Supervisor in Training Supervisor status. The Board stated that if she has her AAMFT – Supervisor in Training certificate, she would be allowed to obtain Supervisor status.

Complaints/Other Legal Matters

No recommendations from the Complaint Committee. All complaints pending.

- a. 2011-007 - Pending
- b. 2011-08 – Pending
- c. 2011-10 – Pending
- d. 2012-002 – Pending

Application Review:

Jane Prouty made a motion to approve all applications, renewals, audits, and CEU Provider Applications reviewed prior to the meeting and ratification of licenses issued and renewed from 4/26/2012 through 5/23/2012. Richard Hamon seconded the motion. The motion carried.

Status Report:

Active Licensee's for MFT's – 500

Active Licensee's for MFTA's – 117

Total Active Licensee's – 617

Associates:

The following applications for Marriage and Family Therapist Associate were approved: *Damon C. Cobble, David Leroy Wilson*

The following application for Marriage and Family Therapist Associate was approved with provisions: *David E. Dillard*

The following Renewals for Marriage and Family Therapist Associates were approved: *Karen Michelle Baker, Mary Jo Mueller, Jane M. Owens, Crystal Whittaker*

The following Renewal for Marriage and Family Therapist Associate was denied: *Jannine Sayago-Gonzales*

LMFT:

The following application for licensed Marriage and Family Therapist was approved: *Stacie Selfe*

The following application for licensed Marriage and Family Therapist was deferred: *Deona D. LeMay*

The following application for licensed Marriage and Family Therapist was approved to take the exam only: *Amanda Blackburn*

The following application for reinstatement of a licensed Marriage and Family Therapist was approved: *Dorney R. Thompson*

The following Renewal Audits for Marriage and Family Therapist were approved: *Valerie J. Areaux, Margaret Favata, John Lewis Fisher, Kelly Marie Parker, Corrine Sackett, James Lynn Vester*

Applications for CEU Approval for 5-24-2012**Approved****Appalachian Play Therapy Center at Lindsey Wilson College**

- A Mythic Fairy Tale of Dreams: Junigan Play Therapy with Children – 12.0 Hours

Bluegrass Regional MH-MR Board, Inc.

- Managing Legal & Ethical Risks in Clinical Practice – 3.0 Hours

CMI Education Institute

- Self-Regulation in Children: Keeping the body, Mind & Emotions on Task in Children with Autism, ADHD or Sensory Disorders – 6.0 Hours
- Trauma, PTSD & Grief – 6.0 Hours

Comprehend

- Incredible Years – Dinosaur School Small Group Treatment – 22.0 Hours

NorthKey Community Care

- Environmental Strategies on Underage Drinking – 12.0 Hours

Seven Counties Services, Inc.

- Stand Up! For Recovery – 2.0 Hours

Sex Offender Risk Assessment Advisory Board

- The 15th Annual Training for Sex Offender Evaluation and Treatment – 12.5 Hours

Deferred:

CMI Education Institute

- Bridging the Couple Chasm: A New Research-Based Approach - Gottman Level 1 Training – 11.0 Hours – Must submit Presenter's vitae
- The Art & Science of Love: A Gottman Method Weekend Workshop for Couples – 13.5 Hours – Must submit Presenter's vitae

Denied

Mika, Linda M. – Individual

- An Open Heart: Witnessing Our Hidden Barriers in Relationship – Must submit application, number of hours of training and all required documentation.

The next meeting of the Marriage and Family Therapy Board is scheduled for June 28, 2012 and will be held at 911 Leawood Drive, Frankfort, Kentucky 40601. Committees will meet at 8:30 a.m. with the Board Meeting to follow at 9:30 a.m.

Tony Watkins moved that Travel and Per Diem be paid to those who attended the work session and the regular Board Meeting on May 23 & 24, 2012. Jane Prouty seconded the motion. The motion carried.

The Marriage and Family Therapy Board meeting was adjourned by Chair Sandy Miller at 12:00 p.m.

Respectively Submitted:

Marcia Egbert
Board Administrator

